Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application, with 1 and 5 being the independent claims. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under Double Patenting

The Official Action indicated that claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,749. The Examiner stated that "[a]lthough the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the differences between the two pending applications are minor wording, which do not change the scope of the invention." Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection.

First, the Examiner makes the rejection based on U.S. patent No. 6,618,749, but compares the pending claims to U.S. Patent No. 6,725,272. There is an obvious error in this rejection since U.S. Patent No. 6,618,749 is not owned by the assignee of the above-captioned application. Applicants will address this rejection based on its comparison to U.S. Patent No. 6,725,272 ("the '272 patent"), which is owned by the assignee of the above-captioned application.

Independent claims 1 and 5 of the above-captioned application recite "allowing said second client to access information on said server via said second connection without waiting for said first client to disconnect." This language does not appear in

claims 1 and 12 of the '272 patent in any form. Applicants submit that this feature changes the scope of the invention such that it is patentably distinct from claims 1 and 12 of the '272 patent and is not just merely a minor wording change as alleged by the Examiner. A double patenting rejection under these circumstances is inappropriate.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,295,551 to Roberts et al. ("Roberts"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner cites to Figure 5, column 2, lines 31-57, column 7 lines 24-62, column 9 lines 25-38, column 10 lines 19-36 and column 15 lines 7-20 as disclosing Applicants' invention. The cited passages merely describe coordinating Internet communications between two users that allow the two users to view and modify a copy of the same multi-media content. Col. 1, lines 10-19. This is accomplished by allowing a first computer 12 and a second computer 24 to access a server 20 through browsers 18, 28, respectively. Col. 7, lines 28-30. A session is created between the first and second computers thus allowing the two computers to view shared content stored on the server. Col. 7, lines 43-62.

Claims 1 and 5 recite "allowing said second client to access information on said server via said second connection without waiting for said first client to disconnect." The passages cited by the Examiner fail to disclose "an interface unit" as recited in independent claims 1 and 5.

The cited passages also do not disclose establishing a second connection between an interface unit and a server. Accordingly, the cited passages also do not disclose allowing the second client to access the server via the second connection. The cited

passages also do not disclose allowing such access "without waiting for the first client to disconnect." The Examiner has failed to point out with particularity any of these elements of the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 1-8 be passed to allowance for at least the reasons provided above.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,085,247 to Parsons Jr. et al. ("Parsons Jr.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,836 to Rowe ("Rowe"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Parsons Jr. teaches enabling "a user to begin a session and later dynamically reconnect to that session even if the user uses two different client computers." Abstract. First, the re-use of an established session on a server is unrelated to the claimed invention, which relates to use of connections established between an interface unit and a server to access information. Second, Parsons Jr. fails to disclose an "interface unit." *See* Figure 1 and related text. This leads to the logical conclusion that a second connection is not opened between an interface unit and a server, as recited in independent claims 1 and 5. Thus Parsons Jr. cannot teach the claimed invention.

Furthermore, Parsons Jr. teaches that a connection between the user and a server is ***disconnected*** when a user leaves a first session. Col. 3, lines 8-13. The claimed invention opens a first connection between a first client and an interface unit and a second connection between the interface unit and a server. It is impossible in Parsons Jr. to allow a "second client to access information on said server via said second connection without waiting for said first client to disconnect," as recited in independent claims 1 and

5, since the connection between the user and the server in Parsons Jr. is disconnected after the user leaves a first session. Parsons Jr. thus teaches away from the claimed invention.

The Examiner also cites column 3, lines 4-13 of Rowe to support her obviousness rejection. Again, the claimed invention opens a first connection between a first client and an interface unit and a second connection between the interface unit and a server. The passage cited by the Examiner does not allow a second client to access information on the server via the second connection without waiting for the first client to disconnect. The passage merely discusses replacing a link object for a second session on a remote computer that has been previously removed subsequent to the termination of a first session. This simply does not teach establishing a connection ***without waiting*** for a first client to disconnect. (In fact, Rowe teaches that the first session is terminated before embedding the link object for the second session thus teaching away from the claimed invention).

Applicants therefore submit that claims 1-8 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 1-8 be passed to allowance for at least the reasons provided above.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: June 20, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

369251_1.DOC